

1 Mark J. Tamblyn (S.B.N. 179272)
2 Email: *mjt@wtwlaw.com*
3 **Wexler Toriseva Wallace**
4 1610 Arden Way, Suite 290
5 Sacramento, California 95815
6 Phone: (916) 568-1100
7 Fax: (916) 568-7890

8 Bernard Persky (*Pro Hac Vice* Pending)
9 Email: *Bpersky@labaton.com*
10 Hollis L. Salzman (*Pro Hac Vice* Pending)
11 Email: *Hsalzman@labaton.com*
12 Kellie Lerner (*Pro Hac Vice* Pending)
13 Email: *Klerner@labaton.com*
14 **Labaton Sucharow LLP**
15 140 Broadway
16 New York, NY 10005
17 Telephone: (212) 907-0700
18 Facsimile: (212) 818-0477

19 ***Attorneys for Plaintiff and the Class***
20 ***(Additional Counsel on Signature Page)***

21 **UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT**

22 **NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA**

23 JEMS SOFTWARE AND CONSULTING,
24 INC., on behalf of itself and all others
25 similarly situated,

26 Plaintiff,

27 v.

28 LEXAR MEDIA, INC., *et al.*,

Defendants.

Case No.: 3:07-CV-05041-EMC

**PLAINTIFF JEMS SOFTWARE AND
CONSULTING, INC.'S NOTICE OF
CROSS-MOTION AND CROSS-MOTION
TO APPOINT LABATON SUCHAROW
LLP AS INTERIM LEAD COUNSEL OR,
IN THE ALTERNATIVE, AS INTERIM
CO-LEAD COUNSEL FOR DIRECT
PURCHASER PLAINTIFFS; RESPONSE
TO MOTIONS FOR APPOINTMENT OF
INTERIM CO-LEAD COUNSEL FOR
DIRECT PURCHASER PLAINTIFFS;
AND MEMORANDUM OF POINTS AND
AUTHORITIES IN SUPPORT THEREOF**

Date: October 30, 2007

Time: 1:00 p.m.

Courtroom: 3, Third Floor

The Honorable Edward M. Chen

**NOTICE OF CROSS-MOTION AND CROSS-MOTION TO APPOINT
LABATON SUCHAROW LLP AS INTERIM LEAD COUNSEL
OR, IN THE ALTERNATIVE, AS INTERIM CO-LEAD COUNSEL
FOR DIRECT PURCHASER PLAINTIFFS; AND NOTICE OF RESPONSE TO
MOTIONS FOR APPOINTMENT OF INTERIM CO-LEAD COUNSEL
FOR DIRECT PURCHASER PLAINTIFFS**

TO ALL PARTIES AND THEIR COUNSEL OF RECORD:

PLEASE TAKE NOTICE that on October 30, 2007, at 1:00 p.m., or as soon thereafter as the matter may be heard, before Hon. Sandra B. Armstrong at the United States District Court for the Northern District of California, 94612, Plaintiff Jems Software and Consulting, Inc. will and hereby does move this Court for an order appointing its attorneys, Labaton Sucharow LLP, as Interim Lead Counsel, or in the alternative, as Interim Co-Lead Counsel for the Direct Purchaser Plaintiffs.

This motion is brought pursuant to Rule 23(g) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure. The grounds for this motion are that this complex case will benefit from the appointment of interim lead counsel and that Labaton Sucharow LLP is the most qualified for this position because, among other reasons, it is the only petitioning firm with an undivided loyalty to the putative Class. This motion is based on this Notice of Cross-Motion and Cross-Motion To Appoint Labaton Sucharow LLP As Interim Lead Counsel Or, In The Alternative, As Interim Co-Lead Counsel For Direct Purchaser Plaintiffs; Response to Motions To Appoint Interim Co-Lead Counsel For Direct Purchaser Plaintiffs; And Memorandum Of Points And Authorities In Support Thereof; the Declaration of Hollis L. Salzman In Support of Plaintiff Jems Software and Consulting, Inc.'s Notice of Cross-Motion And Cross-Motion To Appoint Labaton Sucharow LLP As Interim Lead Counsel Or, In The Alternative, As Interim Co-Lead Counsel For Direct Purchaser Plaintiffs; Response to Motions To Appoint Interim Co-Lead Counsel For Direct Purchaser Plaintiffs; the [Proposed] Order Appointing Labaton Sucharow LLP As [Interim Lead Counsel] [Interim Co-Lead Counsel] For Direct Purchaser Plaintiffs; the record in this matter; and any arguments of counsel.

1 Dated: October 9, 2007

Respectfully submitted,

2
3 **Wexler Toriseva Wallace**

4 By: /s/ Mark J. Tamblyn

5 Mark J. Tamblyn (S.B.N. 179272)
6 1610 Arden Way, Suite 290
7 Sacramento, CA 95815
8 Phone: (916) 568-1100
9 Fax: (916) 568-7890

10 Bernard Persky
11 Hollis L. Salzman
12 Kellie Lerner
13 **Labaton Sucharow LLP**
14 140 Broadway
15 New York, NY 10005
16 Telephone: (212) 907-0700
17 Facsimile: (212) 818-0477

18 Mark Shane
19 **The Law Offices of Shane and White LLC**
20 1676 Route 27
21 Edison, NJ 08817
22 Telephone: (732) 819-9100

23
24 Attorneys for Plaintiff and the Class
25
26
27
28

**MEMORANDUM OF POINTS AND AUTHORITIES IN SUPPORT OF
CROSS-MOTION TO APPOINT LABATON SUCHAROW LLP AS
INTERIM LEAD COUNSEL OR, IN THE ALTERNATIVE, AS INTERIM CO-LEAD
COUNSEL FOR DIRECT PURCHASER PLAINTIFFS AND RESPONSE TO
MOTIONS FOR APPOINTMENT OF INTERIM CO-LEAD COUNSEL**

I. INTRODUCTION

Plaintiff Jems Software and Consulting, Inc. (the “Jems Plaintiff”) by its undersigned counsel, respectfully moves the Court, pursuant to Rule 23(g)(2)(A) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, to appoint Labaton Sucharow LLP (“Labaton Sucharow”) as Interim Lead Counsel or, in the alternative, as Interim Co-Lead Counsel for the Direct Purchaser Actions¹ that have been deemed related by this Court.

The Jems Plaintiff submits that the proposed appointment of Labaton Sucharow is in the best interests of the Class. Labaton Sucharow is a highly experienced firm with a proven record of success and leadership in managing, litigating and prevailing in complex antitrust class actions. Labaton Sucharow has previously obtained several landmark antitrust and class action recoveries. Moreover, Labaton Sucharow does not serve in a leadership capacity in other class actions against the defendants in the Direct Purchaser Actions. Thus, it is uniquely situated to provide undivided loyalty to the proposed Direct Purchaser Class.

In contrast, of the other known movants for lead counsel, all but one firm² already serves in a leadership capacity in one or more class actions against certain of the same defendants in the Direct Purchaser Actions. Indeed, the existing leadership roles of these movants may compromise their loyalties and duties to the proposed Class in the Direct Purchaser Actions. The appointment of Labaton Sucharow, independent class counsel, to vigorously prosecute the Direct Purchaser Actions solely on behalf of the Class is essential under Rule 23(g). Accordingly, Plaintiff’s motion should be granted, and the competing motions should all be denied.

¹ The “Direct Purchaser Actions” refers to Case No. 07-05041 and the direct purchaser cases this Court has deemed related to Case No. 07-00086-SBA.

² The only known movant that does not serve in a leadership capacity in another class action against the same defendants is Reinhardt, Wendorf & Blanchfield. However, this firm principally supports the appointment of Saveri & Saveri, Inc and Pearson, Simon, Soter, Warshaw & Penny LLP as Interim Co-Lead Counsel.

1 In the alternative, this Court should appoint Labaton Sucharow as Interim Co-Lead
 2 Counsel as part of any larger lead counsel structure selected by the Court. This approach will
 3 also serve to negate the above-referenced issue by ensuring that counsel with undivided loyalty
 4 to the Class is present during the course of any settlement or other negotiations during the
 5 prosecution of the case, where the appearance of a potential conflict of interest is most likely to
 6 arise. Moreover, Labaton Sucharow will, if appointed, work inclusively and co-operatively with
 7 attorneys from the other class counsel movants in the prosecution of the Direct Purchaser
 8 Actions. Such a larger structure is also justified by additional factors, including the large number
 9 of defendants (23), the international discovery burden, and the many complex issues here. *See,*
 10 *e.g., In re NASDAQ Market-Makers Antitrust Litig.*, 169 F.R.D. 493, 515 (S.D.N.Y. 1996)
 11 (appointing four co-lead counsel in a multiple defendant case). Finally, the majority of known
 12 movants for lead counsel are based in Northern California, while the defendants are located
 13 around the globe. Appointing Labaton Sucharow, a New York City-based firm, as part of an
 14 Interim Co-Lead structure will, therefore, promote geographic balance within the leadership of
 15 the Direct Purchaser Actions. *Takeda v. Turbodyne Techs., Inc.*, 67 F. Supp. 2d 1129, 1139
 16 (C.D. Cal. 1999).

17 **II. NATURE OF THE DIRECT PURCHASER ACTIONS**

18 The Jems Plaintiff brings this lawsuit as a Class Action on behalf of individuals and
 19 entities who purchased Flash Memory directly from Defendants, their subsidiaries, agents, or co-
 20 conspirators during the period from at least January 1, 1999 through the present ("Class Period").
 21 As used herein, the term "Flash Memory" means all types of Flash Memory sold during the
 22 Class Period, including AND, Not AND ("NAND"), and Not OR ("NOR") technologies, but
 23 excludes all types of static random access memory ("SRAM") or dynamic random access
 24 memory ("DRAM") sold during the Class Period.

25 **III. PROCEDURAL BACKGROUND**

26 Numerous related class actions have been filed alleging price fixing of Flash Memory, a
 27 form of electronic memory that can be reprogrammed and erased. This type of memory is used
 28 in cellular phones, digital audio players, personal computers, digital phones, home gaming

1 consoles and Global Positioning Systems. Defendants are manufactures of Flash Memory in the
2 United States and around the world.

3 All of the known direct purchaser actions are currently pending in the Northern District
4 of California. On September 17, 2007, Plaintiff A Computer Place, Inc. ("Computer Place
5 Plaintiff") filed a Motion to Appoint Saveri & Saveri, Inc. and Pearson, Simon, Soter, Warshaw
6 & Penny LLP as Interim Class Counsel for Direct Purchaser Plaintiffs. On September 25, 2007,
7 Plaintiff Richard Thal filed a Cross-Motion for Appointment of Lieff, Cabraser, Heiman &
8 Bernstein, LLP as Interim Lead or Co-Lead Counsel for Direct Purchasers. Plaintiff Laura
9 Young responded on September 26, 2007 with a motion supporting the Computer Place
10 Plaintiff's proposed structure, or in the alternative, the appointment of Reinhardt, Wendorf &
11 Blanchfield as Interim Co-Lead Counsel with Saveri & Saveri, Inc. and Pearson, Simon, Soter,
12 Warshaw & Penny LLP. Similarly, Plaintiff Westell Technologies, Inc. filed a motion
13 supporting Computer Place, but added that Freed Kanner London & Millen LLC should be
14 appointed a third Co-Lead should the Court determine that a two-firm Co-Lead structure is
15 insufficient. The Jems Plaintiff files this motion to appoint Labaton Sucharow LLP as Interim
16 Lead or Co-Lead Counsel. For the reasons stated herein, the appointment of Labaton Sucharow
17 will best serve to protect the interests of the proposed Class.

18 **IV. ARGUMENT**

19 "In multi-party, multi-case litigation, the district court's success is largely dependent
20 upon its ability to uncomplicate matters." *In re Recticel Foam Corp.*, 859 F.2d 1000, 1004 (1st
21 Cir. 1988). Thus, the "multiplicity of suits requires that the district court be allowed to combine
22 procedures, appoint lead counsel, recognize steering committees of lawyers, limit and manage
23 discovery, etc. to minimize expense to all litigants and to provide judicial efficiency." *In re*
24 *Showa Denko K.K. L-Tryptophan Prods. Liab. Litig.-II*, 953 F.2d 162, 165 (4th Cir. 1992); *see*
25 *also In re Linerboard Antitrust Litig.*, 292 F. Supp. 2d 644 (E.D. Pa. 2003); MANUAL FOR
26 COMPLEX LITIGATION (Fourth) § 10.22 (2004) (the "*Manual*").

1 **A. Appointment Of Interim Lead Counsel Is Necessary**
2 **To Achieve Efficiency And Economy In This Litigation.**

3 Appointment of Interim Lead Counsel is critical to advancing this litigation and
4 proceeding with discovery in an organized and efficient manner. The appointment of Interim
5 Lead Counsel is consistent with the *Manual's* recommended organizational structure and
6 ultimate goal of achieving "efficiency and economy" in the litigation. *See Manual* § 10.221.
7 The proposed Interim Lead Counsel, Labaton Sucharow, clearly meets all criteria for Class
8 Counsel required by Fed. R. Civ. P. 23(g). Labaton Sucharow will fairly and adequately
9 represent the interests of the class. *See* Fed. R. Civ. P. 23(g)(1)(B).

10 Rule 23(g)(1)(C) sets out those factors that must be considered in connection with the
11 appointment of class counsel. In appointing class counsel, the court must consider:

- 12 • the work counsel has done in identifying or investigating
13 potential claims in the action,
- 14 • counsel's experience in handling class actions, other
15 complex litigation, and claims of the type asserted in the
16 action,
- 17 • counsel's knowledge of the applicable law, and
- 18 • the resources counsel will commit to representing the class.

19 In addition, the Court may "*consider any other matter pertinent to counsel's ability to fairly and*
20 *adequately represent the interests of the class.*" (emphasis added). The totality of these factors
21 militates in favor of appointing Labaton Sucharow as Interim Lead or Co-Lead Counsel for the
22 Direct Purchaser Class.

23 **1. Labaton Sucharow Will Serve The Class With Undivided Loyalty.**

24 The Computer Place Plaintiff and cross-movants propose Interim Lead Counsel who may
25 be compromised in their ability to "fairly and adequately represent the interests of the class," as
26 required by Rule 23(g). Specifically, the appointment of these firms raises potential questions of
27 undivided loyalty to the Class in this case based on their current prosecution of other class
28 actions against many of the same defendants in this case. For instance, the following firms also
serve on the Steering Committee or as Co-Lead counsel in similar class actions involving many
of the same defendants in the Direct Purchaser Actions:

- Saveri & Saveri, Inc., Co-Lead Counsel in *In re Dynamic Random Access Memory Antitrust Litigation* (“DRAM Litigation”), MDL No. M:07-cv-01827 (SI) (N.D. Cal); Steering Committee in *In re Static Random Access Memory Antitrust Litigation* (“SRAM Litigation”), M:07-cv-01819-CW;
- Pearson, Simon, Soter, Warshaw & Penny, LLP, Interim Co-Lead Counsel in *In Re TFT-LCD (Flat Panel) Antitrust Litigation* (“LCD Litigation”), MDL No. M:07-cv-01827 (SI) (N.D. Cal); Co-Chair of Discovery in *DRAM Litigation*;
- Freed Kanner London & Millen LLC, Steering Committee in *SRAM Litigation*; Co-Chair of Discovery in *DRAM Litigation*; and
- Lieff Cabraser Heimann & Bernstein, LLP, Interim Co-Lead Counsel in *LCD Litigation*; Steering Committee in *SRAM Litigation*.

Should the Court appoint these firms to a leadership position in this case, they would be placed in a position of representing different classes of plaintiffs with competing claims against the same overlapping defendants. Indeed, virtually all of the defendants in the Direct Purchaser Actions are also defendants in one or more other class actions involving price-fixing allegations concerning computer-related products.

This representation of separate classes against the same defendant creates the possibility of two distinct potential conflicts of interest. First, should any of the repeat defendants have a finite pool of assets from which a recovery is being sought, each class would be vying to recover from the same potentially limited fund. Second, with regard to settlement negotiations, class counsel may favor the interests of one class at the expense of another to obtain a global settlement and release from a single defendant without adequate regard to the relative strengths or weaknesses of the claims of each class.³ While none of the proposed firms for interim lead

³ In *Krim v. pcOrder.com, Inc.*, 210 F.R.D. 581 (W.D. Tex. 2002), the court further expounded upon the potential for a conflict of interest under these circumstances in the context of settlement negotiations. It explained:

[T]he interests of the counsel may conflict with the members of one or more of the classes. The inability of counsel to discuss settlement offers in the other cases and the potential influence one

counsel have engaged, or would intentionally engage in unethical conduct, the potential for either of these conflicts, and the appearance of such possible conflicts, renders their current proposals for appointment as class counsel unsuitable and not in the best interests of the Class.

The above-referenced potential conflicts inherent in bringing multiple class actions against the same defendants are well known. 7A Charles A. Wright & Arthur R. Miller, *Federal Practice and Procedure* §1769.1 (2d ed. 1986) (“A conflict of interest . . . may be present, however, if class counsel is involved in multiple lawsuits for the named representatives or against the same defendants”). This concern has prompted several courts, including this Court, to hold proposed interim lead class counsel inadequate because of its representation of separate classes against the same defendant.

The court in *In re Cardinal Health, Inc. ERISA Litigation* squarely addressed this issue. 225 F.R.D. 552 (S.D. Ohio 2005). In *Cardinal Health*, the court considered competing motions for the appointment of lead counsel in an ERISA action. One of the firms that moved for lead counsel also represented a class in a separate action against the same defendant. *Id.* Several plaintiffs argued that this firm could not serve as lead counsel because its dual representation of two separate classes against the same defendant “will create a situation in which one group of plaintiffs is inevitably favored.” The court agreed, holding that counsel could not represent separate classes of plaintiffs against the same defendant. *Id.* at 557. Specifically, the court found that “[i]f the amount sought by each proposed class could exceed the total assets of the Defendants, then ‘competing claims may impair counsel’s ability to vigorously pursue the interest of both classes.’” *Id.* (internal citations omitted); *cf. Dietrich v. Bauer*, 192 F.R.D. 119, 126 (S.D.N.Y. 2000) (allowing counsel to represent two overlapping classes because the actions were filed against different defendants).

(. . . continued)

case may have on a decision to settle the other are only part of the problem. Counsel are also limited in the information they can or will have the incentive to divulge because of their representation of different parties.

Id. at 590.

1 This Court has come to the same conclusion. *See Strigliabotti v. Franklin Res., Inc.*, No.
2 C-04-0083, 2006 WL 2792417, at *4 (N.D. Cal. Sept. 27, 2006). In *Strigliabotti*, the Court
3 specifically considered the adequacy of class counsel who brought both class and derivative
4 actions against the same defendant. The Court held that the simultaneous representation of two
5 interested groups of claimants against the same defendant posed a conflict of interest. In so
6 holding, the Court explained that “the class and the derivative actions would be competing for
7 the same pool of money, thus creating a structural incentive to favor one group over the other.”
8 *Id.*; *see also Kuper v. Quantum Chem. Corp.*, 145 F.R.D. 80, 83 (S.D. Ohio 1992) (“The
9 rationale for those holdings- that class counsel should not be subject to divided loyalties- applies
10 equally to the competing interests of separate classes vying for relief from the same limited
11 source.”).

12 Indeed, even the mere appearance of a potential conflict is sufficient reason to reject a
13 proposed leadership structure that involves overlapping classes. *See Kayes v. Pacific Lumber*
14 *Co.*, Nos. C-89-3500, C-91-1812, 1993 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 21090, at *26 (N.D. Cal. April 14,
15 1993) (denying class certification because of potential conflict of interest and finding “[t]he
16 responsibility of class counsel to absent class members whose control over their attorneys is
17 limited does not permit even the appearance of divided loyalties of counsel”) (Armstrong, J.)
18 (internal citation omitted); *ABA Code of Professional Responsibility*, DR 5-105 and EC 5-14
19 (prohibiting counsel from representing different plaintiffs with conflicting claims).

20 The Direct Purchaser Class should not be burdened with the complications that may
21 result from either actual conflicts or potential conflicts inherent in the proposed leadership
22 structure of the movants. Instead, the Jems Plaintiff respectfully submits that Labaton Sucharow,
23 a firm that is not in the leadership in any of the other pending groups of class actions against
24 these same defendants, should be appointed Interim Lead Counsel, so that the interests of the
25 proposed Direct Purchaser Class are best protected.

2. **Labaton Sucharow Is The Best Choice To Promote
The Efficient Prosecution Of The Direct Purchaser Actions**

If appropriate structural safeguards are not put in place now, the Class may be exposed to adequacy of representation challenges at later stages of the litigation, such as class certification or settlement approval. The Court has the opportunity at this time to address this manifest inefficiency by appointing Interim Lead Counsel that will best represent the Class throughout the entire litigation. *See, e.g., In re Williams Co. ERISA Litig.*, No. 02-CV-153, 2002 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 27691 (N.D. Okla. Oct. 28, 2002) (considering class certification requirements when appointing lead counsel).

For instance, in *Kuper*, defendants challenged plaintiffs' motion for class certification by arguing that class counsel was inadequate due to its concurrent representation of bondholders and stock holders against the same defendants. 145 F.R.D. at 83. In denying class certification, the court found that the question of whether counsel was qualified to represent the class did not hinge on whether an actual conflict exists, but rather, whether a conflict could develop in the future. *Id.* ("the finding that no direct conflict currently exists is not dispositive of whether Plaintiffs' counsel is qualified to represent the class"); *Kayes v. Pacific Lumber Co.*, 51 F.3d 1449, 1465 (9th Cir. 1995) ("The 'appearance' of divided loyalties refers to differing and potentially conflicting interests and is not limited to instances manifesting such conflict."). The court, therefore, held that counsel's representation of competing classes would "impair" its "ability to vigorously pursue the interests of both classes." *Id.*; *see also Strigliabotti*, 2006 WL 2792417, at *4 (denying class certification because of overlapping representation, which would create a "structural incentive to favor one group over the other").

Similarly, in *Jackshaw Pontiac, Inc. v. Cleveland Press Publishing Co.*, 102 F.R.D. 183 (N.D. Ohio 1984), the court found that the representation of separate classes rendered counsel inadequate because both classes were seeking to recover from the same pool of finite assets of the defendant. *Id.* at 192. *See also Krim*, 210 F.R.D. at 589 (holding that proposed lead counsel were unable to satisfy Rule 23's adequacy requirement because they were involved in multiple lawsuits against the same defendant representing different classes of shareholders, explaining

1 that “[c]lass counsel must act with unwavering and complete loyalty to the class members they
 2 represent.”); *Sullivan v. Chase Inv. Servs. of Boston, Inc.*, 79 F.R.D. 246, 258 (N.D. Cal. 1978)
 3 (finding a conflict based on counsel’s dual representation and attempt to recover from the same
 4 limited pool of assets, concluding that “[t]he responsibility of class counsel to absent class
 5 members whose control over their attorneys is limited does not permit even the appearance of
 6 divided loyalties of counsel”).

7 These potential conflict of interest concerns do not end at class certification. Similar
 8 arguments may be made by objectors to any proposed class settlement unless structural
 9 protections are put in place now. For example, the parties were confronted with this issue in *In*
 10 *re Relafen Antitrust Litigation*, 231 F.R.D. 52 (D. Mass. 2005). There, a proposed global
 11 settlement was reached that encompassed various groupings of state law claims. Objectors
 12 opposed the proposed settlement, arguing that “class counsel ‘was too lazy (or too selfish)’ to
 13 ensure that residents of different states were fairly represented.” *Id.* at 76 (internal citations
 14 omitted). The court disagreed because of the structural safeguards that had been put in place,
 15 which included independent counsel for each group of states. *Id.*; see also *In re Warfarin*
 16 *Sodium Antitrust Litig.*, 212 F.R.D. 231, 250 (D. Del. 2002) (finding that the existence of
 17 separate consumer and third-party payor counsel provides adequate “structural protections to
 18 assure that differently situated plaintiffs negotiate for their own unique interests.”); *Nichols v.*
 19 *Smithkline Beecham Corp.*, No. Civ. A 00-6222, 2005 WL950616 (E.D. Pa. April 22, 2005)
 20 (approving final settlement agreement because the interests of third-party payors and consumers
 21 were represented by separate counsel); *In re Lorazepam & Clorazepate Antitrust Litig.*, 205
 22 F.R.D. 369, 389-94 (D.D.C. 2002). Given the breadth of possible objections that may arise in
 23 the context of global settlements for classes or subclasses, the need for independent counsel to
 24 negotiate the settlements of completely separate classes against overlapping defendants is even
 25 more critical.

26 The Class in this case may face the same preventable hurdles because of the multiple
 27 representation of certain of the proposed Interim Lead Counsel. This challenge would be
 28 avoided entirely by appointing Labaton Sucharow as Interim Lead Counsel. Alternatively,

1 should the Court determine that one or several of the other movants may appropriately serve as
 2 Interim Lead Counsel, the Jems Plaintiff respectfully requests that Labaton Sucharow be
 3 appointed as additional Co-Lead Counsel to ensure that at least one firm with undivided loyalties
 4 to the Class oversees the litigation. This appointment is even more critical for purposes of
 5 settlement negotiations, where it is particularly necessary to involve wholly independent counsel
 6 to represent the Class, which is competing with the other classes to recover from the same pool
 7 of assets.

8 **3. Labaton Sucharow Has The Experience, Knowledge, Resources**
 9 **and Other Qualifications To Serve As Interim Lead Counsel**

10 Labaton Sucharow has vigorously litigated and settled numerous antitrust class actions.
 11 *See, e.g., In re Warfarin Sodium Antitrust Litig.*, 212 F.R.D. 231, 261 (D. Del. 2002), *aff'd*, 391
 12 F.3d 516 (3d Cir. 2004) (Judge Sue Robinson, when approving \$44.5 million settlement, noted
 13 that “class counsel are well-qualified to litigate this type of complex class action, and they
 14 showed their effectiveness in the case at bar through the favorable cash settlement they were able
 15 to obtain.”).

16 Labaton Sucharow has been at the forefront in obtaining substantial recoveries on behalf
 17 of classes of direct purchasers in antitrust litigations around the country. For instance, Labaton
 18 Sucharow recently obtained \$47 million in settlements on behalf of a direct purchaser class of
 19 equity options purchasers injured by an alleged scheme to restrict the exchange listing of equity
 20 options. *In re Stock Exchs. Options Trading Antitrust Litig.*, MDL No. 1283, C.A. No. 1:99-cv-
 21 00962 (RCC) (S.D.N.Y.); *see also In re Maltol Antitrust Litig.*, C.A. No. 1:99-cv-05931 (TPG)
 22 (S.D.N.Y.) (obtaining as Co-Lead Counsel \$18 million in settlements of price fixing and market
 23 allocation claims against Pfizer, Inc. and certain foreign defendants on behalf of businesses that
 24 directly purchased the food additives maltol and sodium erythorbate).

25 Labaton Sucharow is also responsible for substantial recoveries on behalf of indirect
 26 purchasers in prescription drug class actions. In 2004, Labaton served as Co-Lead counsel in *In*
 27 *re Buspirone Antitrust Litigation*, MDL No. 1413 (S.D.N.Y.), and obtained final approval of a
 28 \$90 million settlement with defendants on behalf of consumers and their health insurance

1 providers. The settlement allocated funds to consumers in many states and third-party payors
 2 nationwide, and settled actions alleging anticompetitive conduct by improperly extending the
 3 monopoly in the market for buspirone hydrochloride, an anti-anxiety drug sold under the brand
 4 name BuSpar. In approving the settlement, Judge John G. Koeltl commended lead counsel,
 5 including Labaton Sucharow, as follows: "Let me say that the lawyers in this case have done a
 6 stupendous job. They really have."

7 Labaton Sucharow, as Co-Lead Counsel, represented consumers and third-party payors in
 8 litigation against Mylan Laboratories, Inc. and others regarding alleged price increases for
 9 generic versions of certain prescription drugs. *See In re Lorazepam & Clorazepate Antitrust*
 10 *Litig.*, No. MDL 1290 (TFH), 2003 WL 22037741 (D.D.C. June 16, 2003). These actions were
 11 jointly litigated with the Federal Trade Commission and various state Attorneys General. The
 12 third-party payor and consumer actions resulted in a total of \$135.4 million in settlements.

13 Labaton Sucharow has also obtained extraordinary recoveries in other complex class
 14 actions. For instance, as Co-Lead Counsel, Labaton Sucharow obtained a total of \$101 million
 15 in settlements on behalf of a class of NYMEX natural gas futures traders injured by defendant
 16 energy companies' alleged manipulation of published price indices. This is the second-largest
 17 class action commodities manipulation recovery on record. *In re Natural Gas Commodity*
 18 *Litigation*, C.A. No. 1:03-cv-06186 (VM) (S.D.N.Y.).

19 The following represent a sampling of the recent appointments of Labaton Sucharow as
 20 Lead or Co-Lead Counsel in major pending antitrust class actions:

- 21 • *In re Air Cargo Shipping Services Antitrust Litigation*, C.A.
 22 No. 1:06-MD-01775 (CBA) (EDNY), Labaton Sucharow
 23 was appointed co-lead counsel for plaintiffs and a proposed
 24 class of businesses and consumers who allege that the
 25 defendant airlines participated in a global conspiracy to fix
 shipment surcharges in the \$50 billion airfreight shipping
 services industry and to allocate customers, routes and
 territories.
- 26 • *In re Abbott Laboratories Antitrust Litigation*, C.A. NO.
 27 4:04-CV-01511-CW (N.D. Cal), Labaton Sucharow has
 28 been prosecuting the case as co-lead counsel since 2004,
 shortly after Abbott raised the price of a key HIV drug,
 Norvir, by 400%.

- *In re Foundry Resins Antitrust Litigation*, C.A. NO. 2:04-MD-01638-GLF-MRA (S.D. Ohio), Labaton Sucharow was appointed co-lead counsel for a plaintiff class of direct purchasers who allege that defendant suppliers have illegally conspired to fix prices, rig bids and allocate customers in the market for foundry resins.

Attached as Exhibit A to the Declaration of Hollis L. Salzman in Support of Motion to Appoint Interim Lead Counsel Or, In The Alternative, As Interim Co-Lead Counsel for Direct Purchaser Plaintiffs, is the firm resume of Labaton Sucharow.

Labaton Sucharow also has committed the resources necessary to prosecute the Direct Purchaser Actions. For example, even though the Jems Plaintiff only recently filed its complaint, Labaton Sucharow has been investigating the case since early 2007. Through this private investigation, Labaton Sucharow has amassed a wealth of confidential materials that will assist in the prosecution of the litigation. As a matter of course, Labaton Sucharow has advanced expenses for complex class actions spanning years, in actions in which they have obtained landmark recoveries. As such, the requirements of Rule 23(g) are satisfied.

4. Alternatively, Labaton Sucharow Should Be Appointed Interim Co-Lead Counsel

Alternatively, the Jems Plaintiff requests the Court to appoint Labaton Sucharow as Interim Co-Lead Counsel. As discussed above, the inclusion of Labaton Sucharow in any co-lead counsel structure would ensure that the Class is independently and fairly represented in the event an actual conflict arises based on the other movants' multiple representation of competing classes against the same defendants. Moreover, this is a proposed nationwide class action with defendants located all over the country (and the globe), including New York. A number of parties, as well as defense counsel, will be located in and around New York. The majority of movants, however, are located in Northern California or the Midwest. Indeed, not one other firm currently proposed for Lead or Co-Lead Counsel is located in New York. If the Court were to appoint an Interim Co-Lead structure, the Jems Plaintiff proposes that New York City-based Labaton Sucharow be included to promote geographic balance. *See Takeda*, 67 F. Supp. 2d at

1 1139 ("the geographic diversity of the three co-Lead Counsel should add to, rather than detract
2 from, the efficient handling of this case.").

3 **V. CONCLUSION**

4 For the reasons set forth herein, and in order to provide for the orderly and efficient
5 conduct of the related actions, the Jems Plaintiff respectfully requests that the Court appoint
6 Labaton Sucharow as Interim Lead Counsel.

7 Alternatively, if this Court determines to appoint any larger lead counsel structure, then
8 the Labaton Sucharow Firm should be appointed Co-Lead counsel as part thereof.

9 Dated: October 9, 2007

10 Respectfully submitted,

11 **Wexler Toriseva Wallace**

12 By: /s/ Mark J. Tamblyn

13 Mark J. Tamblyn (179272)
14 1610 Arden Way, Suite 290
15 Sacramento, CA 95815
16 Phone: (916) 568-1100
17 Fax: (916) 568-7890

18 Bernard Persky
19 Hollis L. Salzman
20 Kellie Lerner
21 **Labaton Sucharow LLP**
22 140 Broadway
23 New York, NY 10005
24 Telephone: (212) 907-0700
25 Facsimile: (212) 818-0477

26 Mark Shane
27 **The Law Offices of Shane and White LLC**
28 1676 Route 27
Edison, NJ 08817
Telephone: (732) 819-9100

Attorneys for Plaintiff and the Class